

## Committee on Faculty Roles and Rewards Report

Faculty Senate: AY 2024-2025

### Committee Charge

The University Standing Committee on Faculty Roles and Rewards is charged with ensuring that the processes and timelines proposed to achieve the five goals laid out in the Task Force on Reimagining Faculty Roles and Rewards final report of Fall 2022 are implemented. These goals include:

- 1) Creating transparent workload guidelines that are equitable and inclusive of all faculty appointment types.
- 2) Redesigning reappointment, renewal, promotion, and tenure (RRPT) guidelines that represent more inclusive frameworks for all faculty work.
- 3) Developing a strategy for implementing continuous contracts (i.e. formulation of tenure) for full-time instructional (term) and clinical faculty.
- 4) Clarifying the relationship between the annual review criteria and the RRPT criteria.
- 5) Creating a robust culture of faculty cohesiveness through career development for all.

The Committee shall report to the Faculty Senate on the progress toward these goals at least once each year and shall confer and collaborate with the appropriate committees and campus offices. The Committee shall recognize tenure as a major safeguard of academic freedom, the quality of education offered, and the continuity and stability of the institution.

The Committee shall be co-chaired by a member from the Faculty Matters Committee and the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and Development. The overall composition of the committee must include representation from at least 6 different schools and colleges. There are also three additional Provost appointees for the committee: 1) an Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs or Dean's office representative who can speak about faculty issues; 2) another LAU head/department chair; and 3) a Research Council representative.

### Committee Co-Chairs

- [Kim Eby](#) (Faculty Affairs & Development, Provost Office)
- [Mohan Venigalla](#)\* (Faculty Senate [FS] Faculty Matters Committee, College of Engineering and Computing)

### Committee Members

- [Elizabeth Alman](#) (College of Visual and Performing Arts-elected by FS, term ends 2026)
- [Regina Biggs](#) (College of Education and Human Development-elected by FS, term ends 2025)
- [Melissa Broeckelman-Post](#)\* (College of Humanities and Social Sciences, Faculty Handbook rep, term ends 2026)
- [Sebahattin \(Seb\) Demirkan](#)\* (Costello College of Business-elected by FS, term ends 2026)
- [Daniel Garrison](#)\* (College of Engineering and Computing-elected by FS, term ends 2025)

- [Emily Ihara](#) (College of Public Health-appointed chair/LAU head rep)
- [Naoru Koizumi](#) (Schar School of Policy and Government-appointed Research Council rep)
- [Kelly Schrum](#) (College of Humanities and Social Sciences-elected by FS, term ends 2025)
- [Mark Uhen](#) (College of Science-elected by FS, term ends 2025)
- [Kathleen Wage](#) (College of Engineering and Computing-elected by FS, term ends 2026)

Note: Our Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs rep left in fall semester and our Research Council rep left in January 2025; both will need to be replaced by the provost for the upcoming Academic Year.

\*Asterisk indicates Faculty Senator

### Timeline and Meeting Schedule

In early fall of 2024, Faculty Senate elections were held. The first meeting of the CFRR was held on September 25, 2024, and the CFRR has been meeting monthly since that time. In total, the CFRR had eight meetings in AY 2024-2025.

### Committee Initiatives and Updates

In AY 2023-24, the Committee designated redesigning RRPT guidelines that represent more inclusive frameworks for all faculty work (Goal #2) as the highest priority among the five goals of the Committee's charge. Thus, our activities for AY 2024-25 were solely focused on this goal.

In Summer of 2024 the Committee formed a working group. The working group reviewed the reappointment, renewal, promotion, and tenure (RRPT) guidelines / standing rules for each School/College. In a half-day workshop held in August, the group synthesized these guidelines. We identified the best practices and found some issues that need to be addressed within school/college guidelines; overall, we believe that the RRPT guidance can be significantly improved. The outcome of this workshop laid the foundation for the Committee's AY 25 activities. Moreover, the committee was excited by CEHD's principle on equifinality in their RRPT guidelines, which simply reads, *"The same end state can be reached through many different means and that 'it is at the core of what it means to celebrate (rather than punish) diversity and innovation in faculty accomplishments.'"* We have adopted this as a guiding principle for our work on RRPT reform.

Over the course of the academic year, the Committee has concluded that there are multiple concerns that we need to proactively address. There is a strong case to be made for a more holistic model; specifically, one where each faculty makes a case based on overall contributions and their impact, rather than in one category.

Committee concerns include:

- Most of our guidelines for research, scholarship, and creative activity (RSCA) are outdated and do not reflect the full scope of scholarly contributions that make an impact on our disciplines and

the communities we serve. We need to follow national best practices and identify more contemporary definitions of RSCA that include community-engaged scholarship, innovation and entrepreneurship, digital scholarship, scholarship of teaching and learning, interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary work, and other types of scholarly activity appropriate for our fields of study.

- Genuine Excellence in Teaching and Learning is officially a pathway to tenure and promotion in the faculty handbook, but in practice this has not been a legitimate option for tenure and a level 1 promotion for years. It is rare and difficult to obtain level 2 promotions based on Genuine Excellence in teaching. We need to stop offering a false promise that our faculty might be able to earn tenure based on genuine excellence in teaching.
  - We have Provost-level guidance for evaluating teaching; however, our current guidance does not include a way to differentiate faculty who invest in their teaching and student outcomes, but who might not have a national reputation for doing so, from those who simply do the minimum.
  - While some units have been intentional about truly evaluating high competence in teaching, in others, this evaluation is inadequate; we need to truly evaluate teaching.
- Even though some colleges do require high competence in service, we do not have a university-level requirement for any measure of competence or contributions in leadership and service. In not measuring and evaluating leadership and service, we have unintentionally incentivized faculty to be poor citizens of the university. This has implications for the effectiveness of shared governance. It also means that some people are doing more than their share of service workload and are being penalized for it.
- Workloads vary among faculty members depending on their portfolios. Yet, current RRPT guidelines and practices adhere to the traditional 40/40/20 (Research / Teaching / Service) model. Often, two of the three categories (typically teaching and service categories) are used as mere check boxes in the evaluation process. Lack of consideration for workload variations disfavor those faculty with workloads that are atypical (and not research heavy), and those who make impactful leadership contributions (beyond normal service expectations) within the traditional model.

These recognitions and considerations led to the development of a preliminary framework that included a more holistic approach inside the traditional tracks for tenure and/or promotion (e.g., teaching and mentoring; research, scholarship, and creative work; and service and leadership). The Committee engaged with the new Provost and the Deans Council at the request of the Provost and had a robust and useful discussion that reinforced some of our concerns and raised additional issues. Informed by that discussion and pending a more complete review of other AAU institutions' RRPT practices and criteria, we continue to work on draft guidance.

## **Moving Forward: Current Plan for the Upcoming AY**

Given the complexity of drafting guidance for revised RRPT processes and criteria, the committee has identified several short-term goals (i.e. now through spring 2026) for this work. These include:

- Research the RRPT approaches, metrics, and criteria from selected other AAU institutions
- Create a draft version of definitions for terms currently not well-defined in our processes
- Draft Provost-level guidance for Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (RSCA); Teaching and Mentoring; and Service and Leadership
- Engage the broader community (e.g., faculty, Faculty Senate, academic leadership) to receive feedback on and refine the draft documents
- Consider changes to the structure of the portfolio within the Interfolio Tool to make it more holistic as well as provide suggestions for potential Faculty Handbook revisions that might be needed to support those changes
- If successful with revisions, create recommendations for schools/colleges that would align with institutional guidance

## **Responses to Questions from Faculty Senate Executive Committee**

During the past calendar year has the President, Provost, or Senior Vice President (or their respective offices) announced initiatives or goals or acted upon issues that fall under the charge of your Committee? If so, was your Committee consulted by the President, Provost, or Senior Vice President in a timely manner before the announcement or action? If not, do you believe your Committee should have been consulted? Would it have been helpful to have had the input of your Committee from the outset?

- No, new initiatives or goals have not been announced that fall within our charge. Currently there is nothing that we feel that we should have been consulted about.

Did your Committee seek information or input from the President, Provost, or Senior Vice President or members of their staffs? If so, did they respond adequately and in a timely manner?

- We sought input on a draft document from the Provost and the Deans Council. We had a robust discussion at the Deans Council meeting in January 2025. That discussion has shaped our work this spring semester and our plans for the upcoming Academic Year.

Please suggest how you believe the President, Provost, Senior Vice President and/or their staffs might more effectively interact with your Committee in the future, if necessary.

- Provost Antony has been interested in our work and proactively reached out to Faculty Senate representatives of the Committee. We have been satisfied with his interactions with the Committee's work.

Please relate any additional information you may have regarding interactions between your Committee and the President, Provost, Senior Vice President, or their staff.

- N/A